

Chapter III Methodology

This study focused on the fostering of student independence during student instruction in the venue of Reading Recovery. To discover more about that process, consistent observation and rigorous assessment of those observations were essential (Clay & Cazden, 1990). Understanding individual child development requires that the instructional dyad be observed in an over time study. Neither static scores nor single episodes will convey the needed information because the behaviors of both teacher and student cause each other (Vygotsky, 1962).

Reliability and validity are difficult concepts to deal with in qualitative research studies such as this. When considering the reliability to be the extent to which a study can be replicated (Eisner & Peshkin, 1990), the goal to produce a coherent and illuminating description of a replicable study was critical (Schofield, 1990). Effort was made to provide descriptive aids for replication. Whether the study can be replicated without the researcher having a Reading Recovery background is debatable. Some areas, such as differences in some terminology, would be inevitable. In this study, the use of more than one dyad for the study was considered to be one form of replication, indicating the ability to replicate the study.

This chapter provides details about the participants and procedure used to conduct the study. Also included is a discussion about the decisions made about coding the data as well as about the coding protocols to enable others to replicate the study. In addition, difficulties encountered are described.

Participants

The participants in the study were Reading Recovery teachers and their students. Originally, seven teachers were selected for this study. Each teacher selected one student from her four fall semester students for observation by the teacher. Each student/teacher pair was considered to be a dyad. Unfortunately, only three dyad's successfully discontinued (graduated) students from their programs. (See Appendix D.)

Teachers

All teacher participants were certified reading specialists, held masters degrees in reading, were Title I teachers, and were trained Reading Recovery teachers who had applied that training for a minimum of 5 years. The teachers also had above-average success with students and had a history of discontinuing (graduating) five or more students a year. They each had expressed a desire to improve their teaching and responded enthusiastically when invited to participate in this study. Unfortunately, one of the originally selected teachers could not participate in the complete study because her job description changed, making her delivery of a Reading Recovery program no longer possible. Table 2 lists the characteristics of the selected teachers.

Table 2. Teacher Participants

Characteristic	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3
Years teaching Reading Recovery	5	5	6
Number of students discontinued or graduated (averaged from annual scores).	5	5	5

Because the teachers had been trained by the researcher and had stayed in the program with continued support and direction from her, the lessons obviously reflected a local instructional bias. In the teacher leader role, the researcher had noticed a lack of support for student independence, and it had been addressed in workshops and continuing contact sessions. However, the teacher participants, as some of the first trained, had the least training year exposure to fostering student independence, since it was not a strong focus in the earliest years of the program.

Students

The students selected for the study were students of the teacher participants and attended school in a large county school system. Each student had been selected for the Reading Recovery program because assessments showed them to be more in need of special instruction than their peers (see section on Selection Criteria for Reading Recovery). More than one assessment was used to identify students for the Reading Recovery program as described in the following section.

After determining from the assessment results each teachers' group of four fall semester students, each teacher selected one student based on the following criteria:

- Student expected to succeed in spite of evidence of limited ability collected in the September Observation Survey assessments
- Student is a native speaker of English
- Student has good school attendance records
- Student plans to remain within the school's boundaries for that school year.

Home support was not considered as a selection criterion.

Originally, seven student participants were selected. Because one teacher could not continue the study, one student was removed. Three additional students did not complete the program: one because of placement in a special education program, and two because their families moved away from the school district before the end of the student's Reading Recovery program. The three

students who did complete the study had the following beginning text reading levels:

- Student 1: Level 2
- Student 2: Level A. No print awareness recorded (Not able to do a word/print match in text.)
- Student 3: Level B. Some print awareness recorded (Can do word/print match of No, no, no.

Selection Criteria for Reading Recovery Students

To select the students best qualified for Reading Recovery, a series of assessments are performed to ensure that the hardest to teach students receive instruction first. In the school system where this study was conducted, at the time of the study, all kindergarten students were given the Metropolitan Achievement Test the April before first grade entrance as part of a school system-wide policy. These students were then considered for Title I by rankings based on the previous year's Metropolitan Achievement Test scores. Students selected for Reading Recovery are those with the lowest scores—below the 40th percentile in the language arts portions of the test. The following September, these identified students' first-grade teachers observe the targeted students' classroom performance and choose candidates for placement in Title I and assessment for Reading Recovery if they were in the bottom 10% of their class.

Title I Reading Recovery teachers then administer individual Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement assessments (Clay, 1993a) (hence shortened to Observation Survey) to all identified Title I students. The Observation Survey assessment tool includes (a) letter identification; (b) word test of a local basal list; (c) concepts about print (text); (d) hearing and recording sounds in words; (e) writing vocabulary; and (f) running record of text reading. This assessment is administered to discover what the identified emergent readers know about the reading process. Initially, this assessment tool was used to develop a rank order list from which qualifying students were selected in a prioritized order so that the most in-need students receive Reading Recovery instruction first. The Observation Survey was considered the pre-assessment before instruction began.

Later, all students who have participated in the Reading Recovery program are administered a different version of the Observation Survey at the completion of their individual programs to assure that the students have successfully completed the program and can demonstrate expected reading ability. In June, a third version of the Observation Survey was given to identify post-instructional growth in text level and a continuing self-extended learning system, both of which suggest the continued independent behavior of the students.

Procedure

Observation and Data Collection

The students selected for this study received the normal Reading Recovery program geared for their particular needs. It was assumed that students would not receive Reading Recovery lessons five days a week. In the school district where the study was conducted, the schools set aside half of the day on Mondays for planning, workshops, conferences, and in-service programs. There were also countywide programs for Title I teachers on other occasions during the months, other meetings, teacher workdays, and snow days. Illness could also take away instructional time from the students.

Reading Recovery lessons were observed in the instructional setting of the three Reading Recovery teachers in three different schools in the school district. The setting was a tutoring area in a small section of a room designed for small group instruction. Each Reading Recovery teacher had a collection of little books (leveled for difficulty), magnetic letters, a magnetic board, timer, oak tag sentence strips, and blank writing books.

The researcher assumed the multiple roles of an observing teacher leader, colleague, researcher, and participant observer (Miles & Huberman, 1984). As participant-observer, comments were directed to the general success of the lesson and the attending behaviors of the individual student. The researcher never stated the research focus of fostering independent student behaviors during the new book introduction portion of the lesson.

The collection of data included videotaping the new book introduction segment of Reading Recovery lessons for each dyad three times during the student's program. The researcher and a video camera were included in the classrooms for the videotaping sessions. During these lessons, it was critical to place the video camcorder directly in front of the dyad and zoom in to capture the teacher/student dyadic behaviors and the text of the book being read, thereby enabling observation of the quality of reading performance.

Each student had one or more lessons a week between October and February. The number of weeks in which lessons were held for those students ranged from 18 to 21. The students' lessons were videotaped three times over the course of each student's program as follows:

- Time I: Early in the program (October)
- Time II: Middle of the program (December)
- Time III: Near the end of the program (February)

In addition to the videotaped data, running records, daily lesson plans, teacher interviews, and Observation Survey Assessment results provided rich source data. The Reading Recovery program requires thorough documentation of daily lessons with recording forms. Reading Recovery teachers use running records to record daily assessments of developing student reading behaviors with yesterday's new book. These were collected to compare gains just one day after

the orientation and first attempt data.

Daily lesson plans were collected and reviewed to round out the picture of the teacher/student efforts that supported the reading development and successes with that particular book. These lesson plans provided the collection of information about familiar rereading activities that occurred, strategies tried or taught, word and letter work, hearing sounds in words, story writing, sentence segmentation, and word segmentations. Teachers' comments about the students' work on daily text selections were also collected as part of the lesson plans.

In addition, teacher interviews were conducted to establish agreement between teacher and researcher as to what occurred in specific lessons. To do this the teacher and the researcher looked at that teacher's videotaped lesson together at a time shortly after the lesson was completed if possible. These interviews were conducted to confirm interpretations of the lessons by interviewing the teachers to learn how they perceived the lessons over the course of the study. At the request of the teacher participants, these interviews were not recorded at the time of the interview but were reconstructed by the researcher soon after. The teachers were not guided to focus on the independence of the students during these interviews.

Observation Survey assessment data were also collected.

Transcription of Data

Review of the videotapes and categorization of the data began as soon as each of the lessons had been recorded. Re-sorting and further categorizations continued long after the data collection was complete. The original intention was for the researcher, herself a teacher leader, to both observe and transcribe the lessons. These combined roles affected early interpretations of teacher behaviors that did not serve the study.

Originally, the transcripts of the videotaped sessions were laid out in two columns to separate the student behaviors on the left from the teacher behaviors on the right. This layout interfered with the anticipated interactive ingredient of the dyad behaviors in the sessions. Later, transcripts were redone in a conversational or linguistic format that better displayed the interactive quality of the lessons. In addition, numerous examinations of the videotapes suggested that more subtle behaviors were occurring than were seen at first.

To create an effective coding system for the observed lesson data, two graduate students from the Georgetown University linguistics department transcribed the videotaped data and coded the conversational exchanges in the lessons. The transcriptions also highlighted the nonverbal behavior of both members of the dyads. This work facilitated interpretation of these instructional conversations. (See Appendix E.)

Special attention was given to each independent student behavior, for example, self-corrections, discussions with teachers such as, "It looks like said, but it can't be said. . .," and monitoring. Nonverbal behaviors varied as to their importance; therefore, pauses, appeals, pointing, other

jesters, and speech overlaps were noted and their importance caused either their inclusion or exclusion in this study (Du Bois, Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming, & Paolino, 1993).

Development of Coding Schemas

Development of the coding system for the data was based on other research and on observations of the data as they unfolded. Logic suggests that at first students are not independent and cannot read, and then with engagement, work, and learning, they begin to read, achieving independence. But the data did not present such a simple picture. During the first observation analyses, students appeared to be almost as independent in early lessons as at the end of their programs, jeopardizing the study. But, a closer analysis of independence concepts suggested the shifts in student behavior and ability that were observed.

Clay's coding of student behaviors is principally for running records and related learning. The coding requirement for this study was to code the observations of the focal lessons, which included the two segments of the new book introduction (i.e., new book orientation and the first attempt) and the teacher-student interactions. These conversations were coded linguistically to expand the awareness of conversations as tools that develop learning.

Watson's definition of independence indicates an initial intercognitive process (learning in a social context) followed by intracognitive development (application of internalized learning by the student) interpreted from observable student behaviors. Vygotsky had not developed the theory of learning in a social context into an applicable educational context so the educational work of others is critical. Clay and Cazden shared a single-session approach to several different Reading Recovery events but not how the changes occurred over time (1990). That work presented samples of teaching interactions that caused specific results to occur. A model for assistance in single sessions that lacked an over-time aspect contributed to the development of the coding (McLane & Wertsch, 1986). These studies were used to develop a framework for this study. The result was a focus in the data coding on the dyadic conversations intended to expose the structure of the interactive process, the skill of the teachers, and samples of interactive behavior that suggest independence and self-regulation.

To freeze the frames of behavior, it was necessary to look for a logical system. The work of McLane and Wertsch (1986) offered a pattern from their empirical study about behaviors of adult or child tutors in puzzle problem-solving exercises in a single session experiment. The questions used provided a method for assessing the behaviors in this study:

- (a) Who notes the problem?
- (b) Who regulates the problem (suggests a problem solving strategy)?
- (c) Is this regulation, if performed by the tutor, direct or indirect?

The Reading Recovery dyad was the key to these observations. By studying these dyads, the actual behaviors could be coded, expanding on Clay's definitions developed for the student events during lessons including running records. The teacher behaviors were developed from observed behaviors and some of Clay's work.

With steps for assessing behaviors as a springboard, and the Reading Recovery program as a venue, the study was enabled to consider Vygotsky's theory of learning in a social context, examples of interactive instruction, dyad dialogues, and suggested teacher intentions (Clay & Cazden, 1990).

Coding the Focal Lesson Segment: The New Book Introduction

The primary data source was the transcriptions of the new book introduction of the three-videotaped lessons. The new book introduction has two distinct sections: new book orientation and first reading attempt. Because the two portions of the new book introduction are so different, their coding schemes of necessity are also different, and the data were kept separate to maintain clarity.

The new book introduction section of the lesson was selected for observation because:

1. The main reason for placing the new book at the end of the lesson is that each previous activity has encouraged the child to work on the child's own problems and to actively engage in problem solving. By the end of the lesson, the child should have revised easy reading, letter knowledge, links between letters and sounds, his monitoring strategies in the cut-up story, and should tackle the new book with a repertoire of responses in their most accessible form.
2. Any new learning required for the new book can be introduced and practiced during other segments of the lesson. (Clay, 1993b, p. 14.)

The quotation suggests that the new book introduction is the most appropriate section for a study of student independence. This section has two parts: (a) the book orientation and (b) the student's first attempt to read the new book. To support and challenge the student, the teacher chooses a book with the right amount of new information and exposes the student to an accessible level of text with opportunities to practice known strategies in new situations. The teacher also assesses the topic, language, and new vocabulary before the student sees the text. During the orientation, the teacher uses interactive prompts to develop constructive activity and to support child perceptions and language while meaning and background for comprehension of the story theme are explored.

Development of the Coding Schema for the Book Orientation

During the book orientation, the teacher teaches by modeling and showing the student how to explore the book for knowledge to understand and read the book. If the book is at the right level and matches the student's background experiences, the pictures, theme, some vocabulary, and language provide the student with the support needed to read it (Clay, 1998). If the book is difficult, the teacher builds in sufficient background to help the student.

For example, one student was observed to have a problem with the story where what was heard

in the story text (garbage truck) did not match the illustration (dinosaur). The teacher talked about reality versus imagination. She asked if there were dinosaurs around, and the student responded that they were “only imagined in books and stories.” Initially, he understood, and then he got confused. The teacher reminded him of what he had said. Eventually, students take control of their book orientations, while the teacher’s role recedes to helping with new vocabulary, difficult language patterns, names, or unexpected concepts. When book orientation is complete, the student was ready to read the book.

To code the book orientation, Clay explains what is expected from the orientation and suggests how to do it (Clay, 1993b, p. 37). Therefore, the coding was developed into a four-part coding sheet called the Book Orientation Check Sheet (see Appendix F). The sheet includes what both the student or teacher did, how well the conversation worked, or whether student responses match the teacher dialogue. These data were used to study and evaluate the dialogue as an interactive learning tool and to document how the students eventually took over the orientation task in subsequent lessons. The analysis focused on the quality of the instructional conversations developed to accomplish the points in Part IV of the Book Orientation Check Sheet.

The primary concepts of the Book Orientation Check Sheet are the following:

- Part I. Amount of Talk Used to Develop the Orientation Referred to in IV. Speaks to the instructional conversation at the linguistic level and includes information about types of teacher verbal behaviors and quality of student responses in terms of sentence, phrase, word; accuracy, on topic/off topic; initiative and contributions; and focus on teacher and/or text.
- Part II. Book Handling: Behaviors that Suggest the Level of Teacher Support. For example, who held the book, turned the pages, or pointed to the pictures or the words. (It is not safe to assume that the student should hold the book if independent because if the teacher has a specific point to make she may control the text to get her point across.)
- Part III. Who Initiates Knowledge About the Story, Theme, or Plot, etc. Indicates the level of student engagement and shows student assumption of responsibility for initiating tasks.
- Part IV: The Teacher Ensures that the Student Has the Ideas and Language Needed. Indicates early book orientation responsibilities carried out by the teacher. As the student becomes more competent at the task, the teacher will make fewer contributions.

Each part of this form is considered a unit and each unit receives an evaluation of Assisted, Assisted Dependent, Assisted Independent, or Independent (See Table 1). The evaluations of each unit are summed to provide a total evaluation for the book. The segments within the parts are labeled by one mark for each time any indicated item occurs in Part I. Indications are either T (teacher) or S (student) contributions in Parts II and IV, or A (Assisted), AD (Assisted Dependent), AI (Assisted Independent) or I (Independent) in Part III. The Likert scale was used in Part I of the Book Orientation Check Sheet (Appendix F).

Coding the Book Orientation

The Book Orientation Check Sheet was completed, each part was scored, and the total of the four scores summed. The weight of conversation went from teacher questioning and modeling to students' assumption of portions of the task for themselves. These shifts were noted by observing the recorded teacher and student verbalizations and nonverbal behaviors in the transcript and recorded in the Book Orientation Check Sheet (See Appendix F.).

For example, would be a student able to predict the outcome of the story (understanding the meaning and theme of the story)? Originally, a prediction is Assisted Dependent if it occurs after being prompted by a question. Later the student may make independent predictions and change them when other information suggests that they were incorrect. It is then considered Independent. In the unit of analysis, the student development and self-regulation of the task were evaluated as a total in Parts I and III of the Book Orientation Check Sheet. Table 4 provides an example of the transcript.

Table 3. Example Transcript of Book Orientation Observation

Student	Teacher
	(Relates book to student's experience.) Do you like to paint? This boy has paints at home and he is painting a picture. He is going to hang his picture. He looks about your age doesn't he? And he has a baby in the house. Do you know what he forgot to do? (Points to picture.)
(Negotiating Meaning) What? (Looking at teacher)	
	(Again, relates book to student's experience.) He forgot to close up the paint when he went to hang up his picture. What do you think that baby might do? (Points to picture.)
(Negotiating meaning.) Get into the paint and spill it all over and get it on him. (Looking at picture.)	

Verifying the Book Orientation Coding

The researcher used text, videotapes, transcripts, and the coding form (Appendix F) to study the book orientation portion of the lessons. This was done five times and established inter rater reliability above 98%. Another Reading Recovery teacher trained to code the book orientation by the researcher also used text, transcripts, a coding form, and videotapes to recheck interpretations of the videotapes.

In one case the coder and the researcher watched the most difficult tape together and again coded the data using the coding form. That tape was confusing because the student, Bill, in Time II resisted reading the book, found it difficult, and turned some successes into miscues which caused the reading to be choppy rather than fluent. Although coding helped to separate distracting behaviors from reading behaviors, the discussion was very helpful to confirm agreement on the interpretation of the data. Agreement on coding decisions on each tape reached at least 98%.

Development of Coding Scheme for the First Attempt at Reading

The student's first attempt at reading is the student's opportunity to read the new book as independently as possible. The student's first attempt to read the text follows the book orientation. The teacher provides scaffolding prompts as needed. At this time, students are expected to take what was taught or known and integrate it into a fluently read story.

The research task was to code the behaviors used by each member of the dyad to gain a systematic way to analyze those behaviors. The unit of analysis began when a miscue occurred. For example, a student during his first reading may encounter a word he doesn't know and receive help from the teacher. On the second encounter, he may miscue, and again receiving help. On the third encounter, if he recognizes the word, he has read independently. Each student works to bring story, language, and print together and read in a phrased and fluent manner as they gained meaning from the text.

A miscue might include subsequent miscue behaviors before the initial problem is solved. Coding the behaviors of both the student and the teacher was critical to assessing the progress made within the unit. The teacher prompts should enable the student to solve the miscues that occurred. The coding required observation of behaviors and analysis of the interaction as the teacher and the student worked to enable the student to solve miscues independently.

For Time I, students were expected to exhibit few reading strategies. As reading sophistication developed, students were expected to exhibit more cognitive options for problem solving and teachers could prompt to behaviors not initiated at miscues by the student.

The range of behaviors was expected to expand when the student began exhibit self-correcting, rereading, monitoring, and crosschecking. Gradually, teacher prompts intended to give least support to the student to solve the miscues were expected to emerge as independent behaviors increased. The units and their categories were identified, collected, and sorted for analysis from the transcripts (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Coding decisions were generally resolved by three events:

- Input by the student
- Input by the teacher
- Noting the final event in that behavioral sequence

Final events were assessed by the following questions about determining a solution:

- Was the miscue resolved by the student (Independent)?
- Was teacher support provided incidental (Assisted Independent)?
- Was teacher support provided important (Assisted Dependent)?
- Was teacher support provided essential (Assisted)?

Interpretations and conclusions about specific behaviors were drawn before final determinations were made.

The categories for the observed behaviors were evaluated and sorted. The protocols of the categories came from the behaviors identified in the study. They were:

- Assisted: The student cannot solve the task. Scaffolds by the teacher may include shared reading and tells (telling a word so the student can progress).
- Assisted Dependent: The student has general control of the task but not without support.
- Assisted Independent: The student can do the task but requires support to maintain or regain independence.
- Independent: The student can work on text and resolve orientation or reading issues that occur.

Coding the First Attempt

During the first attempt section of the book introduction, the student is expected to read the new book independently with limited teacher scaffolding. Some miscues are intentionally ignored by the teacher due to their meaningfulness in the context of the sentence (for example, use of an approximation of a word such as Mommy for the text word of Mom).

The coding goal was to identify and separate the categories of Assisted, Assisted Dependent, Assisted Independent, and Independent behaviors identified in the instructional transcripts. By sorting student behaviors and teacher behaviors according to function and identifying the result, categories that emerged could be evaluated to look for student independence as listed in Table 4.

Table 4. Categories of Behaviors to Observe

Category of Behavior	Behavior	Behavior Description
Assisted	Told	The teacher told the word so the student could read on.
Assisted Dependent	Shared reading	The student cannot progress and is helped to get the language and vocabulary of the text organized for reading.
Assisted Independent	Questioning for meaning	The teacher prompts for memory and other cues like picture cues to have the student solve his own problem.
Independent	Self-correction	Student solved his problem without assistance

The student and teacher actions were codes according to the categories in Table 4 as shown in the example in Table 5.

Table 5. Example of a First Attempt with “Baby painted the floor.”

Reading Work	Behaviors	Category
S: Boy	S: miscue	
T: he’s baby	T: told	Assisted
S: paint	S: miscue	
T: painted (speech explanation)	T: told	Assisted
Teacher and Student: Baby painted	Shared reading	Dependent
S: the floor.	S: reading	Independent

These examples show the variety of work within the teacher/student dyad at the behavior level of the study and the category level of the coding that resulted and was used to interpret the behaviors and to identify student independence that emerged. The questions for assessing the final events guided the coding, and the coding served the analysis so the conclusions of the study could be drawn.

Verifying the First Attempt Coding

After first attempt at reading was observed, transcripts of lessons were analyzed and categories were established by the researcher, a different qualified Reading Recovery teacher trained by the researcher was invited to conduct an analysis. This teacher challenged or confirmed the meaningfulness of categories and appropriateness of content of categories. This was done by placing the behaviors into categories defined by the researcher, sorting the results, and sharing those results with the researcher. (See Table 4 and Appendix G.) Differences of opinion were rare as were questions about the interpretation of the data. In the few instances where there was a question, the rater and the researcher discussed the category and outcome until a consensus was reached based on interpretation of the behaviors observed. Agreement was over 99%.

The only other changes in interpretations had to do with expansion on the coding definitions. This occurred because the teacher category of scaffold (SCF) was revised to indicate specific types of scaffolds such as questioning for meaning, visual information, or language. The researcher confirmed the validity of the codes three times. There was final agreement on coding decisions for each tape that reached at least 98%.

Coding Other Data Sources

Coding the Running Records

The running records required in Reading Recovery provided a follow up to student learning during the first attempt. It was an example of independent reading on text that had only been seen once. The teacher did not teach while the student read the selected book for that day, but recorded the student's reading behaviors and identified things that needed to be worked on in the future.

Directions for coding a running record can be found in Clay (1993 a). All running records for the student's whole program were kept for analysis and data were gleaned such as number of lessons below 90% to gain insights about the individual students. (See Appendix G.)

Coding the Daily Lesson Plans

Daily lesson plans offer additional information about lessons including familiar rereading activities that occurred, strategies tried or taught, word and/letter work, hearing sounds in words, story writing, sentence segmentation, and word segmentation. The teachers' comments about the students' work on daily text selections also were collected. Specific elements of the lesson plan were surveyed such as the story writing to determine the relationship and similarities of words written with words read. These data helped develop the picture of each dyad for Chapter IV.

Coding the Teacher Interviews

The teacher interviews were conducted following the taped sessions but were not recorded, at their request, either by audiotape or notetaking. During a video review and afterwards, there was an unstructured discussion between the teacher in the video and the researcher. Minimal field notes were developed after the session and later an attempt was made to enhance them. These data were coded by topic to establish agreement about what was observed.

Synopsis

This study was propelled by Vygotsky's theory of learning in a social context. By observing interactive instructional and learning behaviors within dyads it was anticipated that examples of emerging student independence would appear. The method of inquiry was important but more critical was how the method fit together and compared to other choices for a similar exploration (Gee, 1999). By using the data collecting forms provided in any student's Reading Recovery program and then developing a method to assess the behaviors, tools appropriate to the study were used.

This study was envisioned as a series of tutorial lessons observed as structured conversations intended to assist the student to integrate new and old knowledge bits and apply them to successful reading (Gee, 1999). The teachers prompted the student's efforts in ways that kept the students progressing and retrieving ignored or forgotten bits of stored knowledge useful for current solutions. Language is a tool and it shifts as a student's level changes in ways that support the independent appropriation of helpful reading behaviors. The complexity of strategies and dialogue was captured.